



A Reappraisal of Roman Libraries in the "Scriptores Historiae Auguste"

Author(s): Lorne D. Bruce

Source: *The Journal of Library History* (1974-1987), Vol. 16, No. 4 (Fall, 1981), pp. 551-573

Published by: [University of Texas Press](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/25541223>

Accessed: 04/05/2013 09:14

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at
<http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



University of Texas Press is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Journal of Library History* (1974-1987).

<http://www.jstor.org>

A Reappraisal of Roman Libraries in the *Scriptores Historiae Augustae*

Lorne D. Bruce

The existing literary knowledge about libraries from the second to the fourth centuries at Rome is largely furnished by the collection of authors known as the *Scriptores Historiae Augustae*.¹ This work, which has never enjoyed a reputation for accuracy among modern scholars since the initial critical commentary published at Paris in 1603 by Isaac Casaubon, has provided library researchers with many passages that have been used to support statements and illustrate the nature of libraries in Rome, especially the Ulpian Library. However, most of the evidence pertaining to libraries in the *Historia Augusta* (HA) has not been critically evaluated by library historians because the standard works on ancient Roman libraries by Carlo Castellani,² Filippo Garbelli,³ André Langie,⁴ Clarence E. Boyd,⁵ and Max Ihm⁶ were completed before the more radical theories on the HA were fully developed, debated, and gradually accepted by scholars in this century. The more recent standard library discussions are more cautious on this subject, but have relied upon earlier works for synthesis.⁷ Since 1963 annual *Colloquia* devoted to the HA have been held to provide historical and textual commentaries.⁸ The publication of this research has greatly helped to clarify the issues about the HA, and ultimately a "definitive" commentary will be published as a result of these *Colloquia*. It is the purpose of this article to reevaluate the statements in the HA referring to libraries, and to develop new explanations for these passages with regard to accuracy and reliability. The general effect, it must be admitted at the outset, will be revisionist, because for historical purposes many parts of the

HA are no longer regarded as valuable historical or biographical sources.

The HA itself deserves a brief introduction to understand the voluminous studies devoted to it. The entire collection was ostensibly written during the reigns of Diocletian and Constantine, that is, from 284–337 A.D., because some lines are dedicated to these monarchs or personages associated with them. Today it is the major continuous history of the imperial Caesars in the second and third centuries and remains a vital work for scholarly study. According to the manuscript tradition, six biographers—Aelius Spartianus, Julius Capitolinus, Vulcacius Gallicanus, Aelius Lampridius, Trebellius Pollio, and Flavius Vopiscus—composed biographies of the Roman emperors from the time of Hadrian to Diocletian. In addition, the biographers claim to have written other works that are not extant; there is an extensive lacuna for the period 244–259, and numerous usurpers' lives are included. The authors attempted to follow the model of Gaius Suetonius Tranquillus's *De vita Caesarum* by giving information on various aspects of the emperors' lives: their ancestry, personality traits, physical appearance, and so on. This emphasis on personality and private details seldom adds historical value or even literary interest to the biographies. In addition, they are fond of quoting documents such as letters, speeches, senatorial decrees and acclamations, or inscriptions to authenticate and illustrate their histories, especially the cases of lesser-known imperial figures.

A century of research has produced many divergent theories about the HA. The first serious attacks on its genuine historical value were launched a century ago by scholars who believed much of the documentary evidence had been forged. Few scholars now believe the Diocletianic or Constantinian date of the HA; it appears that a date at the end of the fourth century, most likely the decade of the 390s, is more authentic. Further, the six biographers are believed to be one writer, perhaps an editor, whose purposes are subject to controversy. In this article the biographers are assumed to be one person who disguised himself for some reason by giving his work an earlier origin.⁹ On the question of literary references and documents produced there has been general consensus: these documents and texts are very suspect, perhaps completely fabricated for the purpose of entertainment. Are we dealing with forgery or deceit? It is difficult to judge exactly. When examining the HA it is wise to be conservative and circumspect. As research continues on the HA the explanations for the authorship, date, and purpose multiply; but in the words of an authority, Sir Ronald

Syme, writing in 1968: "With the HA the great danger is still credulity."¹⁰ This may be overstating a case in strong terms, yet caution is advisable.

There are a number of occasions when the imperial biographer refers to librarians and libraries at Rome. Before these references are studied, it must be advised that in this article the passages in question are believed more to illuminate the author's character than to describe in detail the existing conditions of the libraries at Rome in the second, third, and fourth centuries. I completely support the statement: "The author is a scholar, devoted to the techniques of research. He likes libraries."¹¹ There are repeated passages throughout the HA that show the author is anxious to convey the impression that his efforts to research and record history have been quite extensive.¹² He is able to read Greek.¹³ He is capable of discerning problems of confusion among genuine historical writers that modern researchers know he used, such as the Greeks Herennius Dexippus and Herodian, and the Latin epitomes of Aurelius Victor and Eutropius.¹⁴ He even reveals facts that would otherwise be unknown from any other ancient literary source, a good case being the building of Hadrian's wall ca. 122.¹⁵ Because the HA freely introduces or intersperses the element of fiction, critical enquiry is essential to decide how much is invention, how much is fact. This aspect is the real difficulty in dealing with the HA. In the absence of evidence to corroborate statements appearing in the HA, one cannot be certain how seriously its statements should be considered. The character of the sources that have been drawn upon becomes as important as studies of the authorship and the date. But in many instances what can be inferred from the HA is as important as what is read from the statements of the bogus biographers. Behind each statement of "contemporary" events or facts pertaining to an emperor, one must recognize it is the author's real intention to mislead the reader.

To begin the enquiry on the HA's use of libraries for information, there are passages in the earlier lives that do not refer specifically to libraries or librarians, but provide some reliable information that can be utilized by library historians. The author "Julius Capitolinus" was responsible for the lives of Antoninus Pius (137-161), Lucius Verus (161-169), and Marcus Aurelius (161-180). On the whole his statements have a more accurate and trustworthy base than the later chapters in the HA, although the life of Verus is rhetorical in character and contains more anecdotes or interpolations, and the lives of Pius and Marcus are uncritical on many points. However, some substantive information is pro-

vided, and on three occasions Capitolinus makes references that can be utilized to infer that the library in the imperial residence on the Palatine was in active use during the mid-second century. These passages, in order of appearance, are summarized as follows.

- A. *Antoninus Pius* 10, 4: At one time Antoninus summoned the Stoic philosopher Apollonius of Chalcis to his residence at the *domus Tiberiana* so that he could tutor Marcus Aurelius. Despite the imperial request Apollonius refused by saying the master should not come to a pupil, but a pupil come to the master. Antoninus thereupon rebuked the philosopher.
- B. *Marcus Antoninus* 2, 4: Marcus's masters in oratory were the Greeks Aninus Macer, Caninius Celer, Herodes Atticus, and the Latin Cornelius Fronto.
- C. *Marcus Antoninus* 6, 3: When he was designated as Pius's colleague in power, Marcus Aurelius was given the consulship and title of Caesar, then ordered by Pius to take up official residence in the *domus Tiberiana*.
- D. *Verus* 2, 4–5: Verus was reared in the *domus Tiberiana* receiving instruction from the grammarian Scaurus and the Greeks Telephus, Hephaestio, Harpocrates; his rhetoricians were Apollonius, Caninius Celer, Herodes Atticus, and Cornelius Fronto; his philosophers were Apollonius of Chalcedon and Sextus of Chaeronea.

The *domus Tiberiana* was the large palatial residence of emperors on the northwest summit of the Palatine Hill originally begun during the reign of Tiberius (14–37). This palace was occasionally occupied by the Caesars until the sixth century.¹⁶ The archaeological remains of this building and its library are slight; most discussion of the library has revolved around two citations that are reasonably contemporaneous with the four passages cited in the HA above. This related knowledge of the library in the *domus Tiberiana* is essential because the HA does not actually refer to the library but to the palace. Marcus Aurelius himself mentioned the librarian working in the palace in a letter to his friend and teacher Marcus Cornelius Fronto about 144–145 relating that a speech by Cato the Censor was sought from the *Tiberianus bibliothecarius*.¹⁷ The library is also specifically mentioned by Aulus Gellius (ca. 130–180): he recounted sitting in this library with his teacher, Sulpicius Apollinaris, when they were brought a book written by M. Cato Nepos.¹⁸ Although Capitolinus does not actually make direct reference to the library in the Tiberian palace, it is certain

the tutors and students made good use of the collection for research, study, and discussion. What the HA does add to our knowledge is a fuller chronological outline in a period when the library in the Tiberian palace was in active use.¹⁹ It also suggests that the emperors Antoninus Pius, Marcus Aurelius, and Lucius Verus regarded literary studies as an important part of their daily lives in contrast with later emperors in the third and fourth centuries.

The mid-second-century chronology of the Tiberian library can readily be deduced from the HA. Aurelius received the title as Caesar in 138, and was consul with Pius in 139. It was normal practice to receive teaching from a *grammaticus* from age eleven to fifteen, and to receive training from a rhetorician between fifteen and twenty, perhaps a bit longer.²⁰ Verus would therefore have been educated by the grammarian and orator before ca. 150; Marcus's rhetorical study would have ended earlier, ca. 141. Marcus is said to have abandoned rhetoric about 146/147 for Stoic philosophy, which becomes apparent in his *Meditations*. It may be said that the library in the *domus Tiberiana* was actively used between 138 and 150 according to the evidence provided by Capitolinus. There is no information about the content of its collection in the HA, although it may be reasoned from Marcus's and Gellius's remarks that after a century of development and new acquisitions its quality was recognized by many scholars at Rome.

The first mention of library directors in the HA occurs in the life of Hadrian by "Aelius Spartianus." Here is found the name of Eudaemon, who assisted Hadrian in obtaining imperial power and was reduced to poverty by the suspicious emperor.²¹ This person was first linked by Otto Hirschfeld with an anonymous *procurator bibliothecarum* attested by inscriptions in Asia Minor at Ephesus (published in 1873) and in Syria at Berytus, discovered in 1879.²² In this capacity Eudaemon would have been responsible for all libraries in Rome directly under the emperor, because this was an imperial appointment. Hirschfeld's emendation to the inscription is now accepted.²³ The last years of Hadrian's reign were clouded by the execution of the conspirators, Julius Servianus and Pedanius Fuscus, in 136; thus Eudaemon's fall from favor may be a typical case of the atmosphere absolute power can create. His eclipse did not last many years, however, for Antoninus Pius later appointed the former director of libraries to the very important post of prefect of Egypt ca. 141/142.

Valerius Eudaemon was not the only man who had served as imperial administrator of libraries before he incurred the displeasure of Hadrian. Until 1952 it was not known that the famous

biographer Gaius Suetonius Tranquillus (b. 69) had been a library director: Suetonius served in the imperial palace as *a studiis*, *a bibliothecis*, and *ab epistulis*²⁴ before he was dismissed from this last post by Hadrian ca. 121/122. Spartianus gives this colorful, perhaps fanciful reference in *Hadrianus* 11, 3, where it is stated that Hadrian replaced his secretary of correspondence because he had behaved improperly with the emperor's wife, Vibia Sabina. Suetonius's career in the imperial service, especially his post as library director, accounts for the detail in his *De vita Caesarum*, which frequently utilizes Greek and Latin documents to elaborate the Caesars' lives, even their library policy.²⁵ It is no surprise that the author "Flavius Vopiscus" expresses a preference in *Probus* 2, 7, for Suetonius the historian over Sallust, Livy, and Tacitus. Again, one theme of the author of the HA, recording simple facts rather than composing an eloquent history, is invoked. In fact, the qualities of the encyclopedist, the arrangement *per species*, the literary simplicity, the inclusion of documents, and the anecdotal nature of many parts of the HA recall features of the *Lives of the Caesars*. Is it possible to suggest that the author of the HA might have served as *a bibliothecis* for a time and chose to write a biographical form of history? This is a possibility discussed later in this article, but cannot be a certainty because the author's identity and the reason he composed his work have evaded scholars for a century. Certainly his identification as a researcher-librarian would explain his ability to weave fact with fiction and escape detection, but the question must be posed: why disguise his ability or introduce bogus names, facts, and incidents? An identification of the writer cannot be complete without an explanation of his varied purposes.

Two further references to librarianship occur in the early chapters of the HA in a typical indirect fashion; both offer information on Lucius Volusius Maecianus. *Antoninus Pius* 12.1 states that Maecianus was one of the legal experts frequently consulted by Antoninus for legal matters. The same jurist is noted in *Marcus Antoninus* 3.6 as a legal lecturer to the future emperor Marcus Aurelius. Again, it is necessary to consult epigraphic remains to recognize that Maecianus had also served as *a studiis et procurator bibliothecarum* under Antoninus after 138; indeed, Maecianus's administrative career was so distinguished that he eventually secured senatorial rank, his reward for outstanding administrative service.²⁶ However, the HA does not elaborate on his life or writings; the author is content with these casual references. The elaboration of the career of all three known administrators—their backgrounds, their training, their contact with various emperors—

remains a task for modern scholars to take up using the HA's brief remarks as footnotes.

Thus far the second-century references to library matters in the HA do add some substantive information when used with other sources. It must be noted that the author was reluctant to offer detail about the location of his research material. Obviously he re-worked familiar ground in his biographies and deliberately chose not to introduce evidence his readers would immediately suspect if they were knowledgeable on the topic. When combined with other evidence, it is possible to establish an indication of the usage of the library in the *domus Tiberiana* and episodes in the administrative careers of Valerius Eudaemon, Suetonius, and Maecianus. But beginning in the third century, the biographies' accuracy disappears, to be replaced by forged documents, fictional events, and bogus names. Strangely, as more information is paraded forth and extensive detail recited, the quality of the information deteriorates markedly. Unfortunately for library historians, it is these third-century passages that have attracted most commentary. In many cases these references have not received critical examination; they have been taken at face value. But, as the following review will demonstrate, the best material on libraries at Rome that the HA has to offer has already been presented here.

Capitolinus makes one additional reference to libraries in his biography of the three Gordians, who came to the imperial purple during the chaotic years immediately after the death of Alexander Severus in 235. In *Gordiani tres* 18, 2-3, Capitolinus states that Gordian II (d. 238) was a well-educated person who had studied under Serenus Sammonicus, junior. After Sammonicus died, the 62,000 books that had belonged to his father were willed to his former pupil Gordian II, who was naturally delighted with the magnitude and quality of this collection. This fact is not known from any other source, which should arouse suspicion, but it has been generally accepted in library studies.²⁷ Two scholars have suggested that Sammonicus's private library may have passed into the library collection in the Palatine, Pantheon, or Ulpian Library, or been gradually dissipated during the third-century period of disorder.²⁸ However, it is not necessary to expand these suppositions. More in question is the very existence of Serenus Sammonicus, junior, himself! It is likely that he is one of the invented names the author of the HA uses on occasions to enliven his histories and provide tantalizing facts that are otherwise impossible to corroborate.²⁹ Also, the existence of this private library may be doubted simply because of its immense size, which is far larger

than any other reported private collection in antiquity.³⁰ This private library should now be regarded as fiction.

Another third-century reference in the HA occurs in *Tyranni Triginta* 31, 10, where the author "Trebellius Pollio" says that none of his critics in the *Templum Pacis* would be able to claim he had included women among the thirty pretenders, because he appends the lives of two more tyrants, Titus and Censorinus, at the end of his collection to make thirty men and two women. Pollio is anxious not to give his critics an opportunity to criticize his fanciful history. The purpose of the *Tyranni Triginta* is to give brief sketches of the imperial usurpers who flourished in the mid-third-century turmoil, but in fact the information verges on the fantastic in most instances. Pollio's critics may not have existed. The *Templum Pacis* was destroyed in a fire during Commodus's reign (180–192) but was rebuilt in subsequent years by Septimius Severus and Diocletian, and renamed Forum Pacis in the fourth century.³¹ It is interesting to note that Pollio, ostensibly writing during Constantine's reign, refers to the older name for this spacious area, giving his aside an authentic touch. Ammianus Marcellinus, writing in *Rerum gestarum libri* 16.10.14, refers to the Forum Pacis in connection with Constantine II's visit to Rome in 357. His reference, together with archaeological work, demonstrates that the *Biblioteca Pacis* located in a temple in this forum still existed in the fourth century. The library building proper eventually became part of the church of St. Cosmas and Damian erected by Pope Felix IV (526–530). It appears, therefore, that Pollio's reference may be reliable, for it would not be unusual for critics or literati to gather at the library to debate various topics or engage in Socratic dialogue. The statement frequently has been accepted by library historians,³² and I believe Pollio was aware this passage would add credence to an otherwise unreliable chapter in imperial biography.

The most extensive use of libraries in the HA is made by the author "Flavius Vopiscus" of Syracuse. He has much incidental information to offer about the libraries at Rome that he claims to have used when composing his histories of the emperors Aurelian (270–275), Tacitus (275–276), Probus (276–282), Carus (282–283), Carinus (283–285), and Numerian (283–284). Vopiscus, according to his own testimony, is an indefatigable researcher intent on recording history as it happened without pretentious literary style. At the same time, he is also disarmingly careful to give notice that his sources can be verified if the reader decides to take the oppor-

tunity to do so. These laudable qualities have disguised his misrepresentations in the nine instances where he refers to libraries.

Vopiscus's lengthiest passage that involves libraries occurs in his famous introduction to the life of *Aurelianus* 1, 1-10. To summarize his opening, during the festival of the *Hilaria* the prefect of the city of Rome, Junius Tiberianus, who claimed a relationship to Aurelian, took the author into his official carriage to engage in casual conversation. After they arrived at the Temple of the Sun, Tiberianus lamented that there were no Latin histories of his illustrious relative, only ones in Greek, despite the fact that Aurelian's own written journal (*ephemerides*) and his historical record of wars (*digesta*) still existed. Then he exhorted Vopiscus to write the emperor's biography by researching the facts from the linen books that Aurelian had ordered compiled (*libri lintei*). Tiberianus suggested these could be located in the Ulpian Library. The prefect expressly stated that he would give official approval for Vopiscus to have access to these books. Vopiscus concludes by saying he followed these instructions by consulting the Greek books (*lectites Graecos*) and linen books, and he adds that these materials can be studied in the Ulpian Library at any time upon demand.

What is fact, what is fiction in this remarkable episode? To begin, the *Hilaria* was an annual spring festival celebrated on March 25 in honor of Cybele, the great mother-goddess.³³ The entire day was given over to banqueting and merrymaking, and this particular introduction may be the author's technique to preface a fictional story with wry humor. Junius Tiberianus has usually been identified as city prefect of Rome during Diocletian's reign from 18 February 291 to 3 August 292.³⁴ The temple of Sol was erected by Aurelian during his five-year reign in the Campus Agrippae on the Quirinal Hill.³⁵ The *libri lintei* were traditionally archival lists of magistrates written on linen housed in the temple of Moneta dating back to the early fifth century B.C. Republican period and first cited by the historian Livy.³⁶ The Ulpian Library was constructed for the emperor Trajan by the architect Apollodorus of Damascus in a magnificent new forum ca. 114 and is last attested by the Christian bishop and author Sidonius Apollinaris, whose statue was set up in this library after he recited an extensive panegyric in verse to the emperor Avitus on 1 January 456.³⁷ The phrases illustrious man (*vir inlustris*) and the official carriage (*carpentum giudiciale*) do not inspire confidence because they are suspected to be anachronisms by some scholars, although this charge is denied by others.³⁸

Despite the factual references, there have been harsh judgments

made concerning the entire incident: it has often been branded as complete fiction.³⁹ Thus, its value is questionable—even the existence of the *libri linteï* is doubted.⁴⁰ Library researchers have been more kind, perhaps believing that Vopiscus's account of linen books and Greek histories is generally trustworthy and that it is no surprise that the Greek biographies and written war journals have disappeared after the passage of time. The destruction of literature is, after all, not an uncommon fate. Many historians have quoted the passage concerning the *libri linteï* to illustrate some of the contents of the Ulpian Library.⁴¹ But it is important to realize that the very existence of the *libri linteï* is revealed in a circuitous, clever fashion. Tiberianus seems to have had knowledge of these books, perhaps because of his stated family connection. The prefect obviously had not read them himself, because he asked Vopiscus directly who had written a biography of Aurelian (1, 3). No authorship is stated: the *libri linteï* are demonstrated to have been in existence because Vopiscus searched for them and found them himself, a rather dubious proof. Because Tiberianus's relationship to Aurelian is suspect,⁴² and he appears ignorant of the authorship, it is justified to doubt the existence of the *libri linteï* as well. The case for the linen books is not proven, especially if one examines the documents discussed later in this article that Vopiscus alleges derive from the Ulpian Library shelves.

One further point of interest has arisen from this stimulating passage. A claim has been made that the prefect of Rome may have taken direction of the city libraries in the late third century.⁴³ Formerly this position had been the responsibility of the *procurator bibliothecarum*, directly appointed by the emperor. The city prefect was an important personage, and it is likely he could arrange for anyone to have access to any city library. Nevertheless, Tiberianus does not issue an order for Vopiscus to have access to the books; he says he will merely expedite the matter, perhaps meaning he will make arrangements with proper officials. On the whole, it is not sound to regard this statement as factual evidence for the power of the *praefectus urbi* over Roman city libraries. The statement by itself proves nothing; in fact the office and powers of the city prefect in the fourth century remained little changed from the previous centuries.⁴⁴

Later in Aurelian's biography Vopiscus introduces some of the evidence in the linen books of the Ulpian Library. Examining these documents illustrates their essential worthlessness. In *Aurelianus* 8, 1-5, he discloses the contents of a letter (*epistula*) written by the emperor Valerian (255-260) to the consul Antoninus

Gallus, which he inserts into his history verbatim. It relates that Aurelian was too stern and that even Valerian feared him at times. At the beginning it is revealed that Valerian's son, Gallienus, was guarded by the imperial usurper, Postumus (259–268), but this is not a historical fact.⁴⁵ Next, in *Aurelianus* 9, 1–7, Vopiscus includes another letter by Valerian praising Aurelian; he claims he located it in the files of the city prefecture (*ex scriniis praefecturae urbanae*). Valerian's letter is addressed to the *praefectus urbi*, Ceionius Albinus, asking for supplies and money for his soldiers at Rome; it also contains numerous administrative procedures that contradict reality.⁴⁶ There is nothing in these letters to commend. The consul Antoninus Gallus is not attested elsewhere. The second letter to Ceionius Albinus, who is apparently M. Nummius Ceionius Annius Albinus, who served as urban prefect in 256 and 261–262,⁴⁷ contains inaccurate descriptions of administrative affairs at Rome. The prefect of the treasury (*praefectus aerarium*) was not responsible for providing supplies directly to an army officer, even of Aurelian's ferocious calibre.⁴⁸ The most that can be said for these letters is to echo Vopiscus's reason to introduce them for curiosity's sake, “sed curiositas nihil recusat” in *Aurelianus* 10, 1. The letters are curious—and worthless. Boyd cites the first letter to illustrate the contents of the Ulpian Library,⁴⁹ but this should be discarded. Nor is there sufficient basis to postulate that the files of the city prefecture are equivalent with the library in the Tiberian Palace,⁵⁰ particularly in an instance such as this where the documents are obviously spurious. These two letters are simply forgeries passed off as history by the author of the HA.

Vopiscus relates a third incident that he confirmed in books at the Ulpian Library. In *Aurelianus* 24, 2–9, when Aurelian was besieging the city Tyana in Asia Minor, the philosopher-mystic Apollonius of Tyana appeared before him in his tent, and then asked Aurelian to spare his native city. Aurelian, greatly impressed by his visitation, promised to erect a portrait, statue, and temple for Apollonius. Vopiscus claims he learned of this incident from trustworthy men, and later read it in the books at the Ulpian Library. He believed the entire story was true because of Apollonius's remarkable fame, and he adds that there are Greek biographies of the philosopher that can be consulted. What are the facts? Apollonius of Tyana died ca. 98 during the emperor Nerva's reign.⁵¹ Tyana was indeed invested by Aurelian in early 272, but more sober historians such as Zosimus fail to mention Apollonius;⁵² the only extant Greek biography of Apollonius was composed by Flavius Philostratus (b. ca. 170), who of course makes no mention of

this incident because his *Life of Apollonius of Tyana* was completed about the year 220. In short, there is little profit in evaluating this episode; the reference to the Ulpian Library is again useless despite previous acceptance.⁵³

Having provided rather questionable information on Aurelian's life, Vopiscus continues in the same vein throughout his history of the emperor Tacitus.⁵⁴ In *Tacitus* 8, 1-2, he cautions the reader by divulging that he has not rashly placed his trust in Latin or Greek authors for an account of Tacitus's assumption of power, but referred to a decree of the senate (*senatus consultum*) signed by Tacitus when he became emperor; he found it in the sixth case (*armarium*) inside an ivory book (*liber elephantinus*) in the Ulpian Library. It is known that the *senatus consulta*, the advice of the senators to magistrates, were normally deposited in the Atrarium, the treasury of Rome in the temple of Saturn. The last known decree is dated 280, or shortly after Tacitus's death in 276. It is not credible that the decree referred to would be housed in an ivory book in the Ulpian Library, for this fact contradicts other sources.⁵⁵ The most telling argument against acceptance of the statement is presented by Vopiscus himself. In *Probus* 7, 1, the biographer relates that the personal judgments of Claudius and Tacitus concerning Probus would be too long to include in his history, but that it was reported Tacitus said Probus should be selected emperor by the senate when first offered imperial power himself. Despite a search, Vopiscus had been unable to find this senate decree (*senatus consultum*). Needless to say, Vopiscus has contradicted himself on this point. The only credible fact to emerge from these two passages is the arrangement of books in cases, hardly a significant point because it is revealed in many other ancient sources and archaeological discoveries.⁵⁶

The problem of attempting to distinguish between trustworthy historical references and more fanciful material is displayed by Vopiscus in *Probus* 2, 1, which has produced much commentary. Here Vopiscus mentions that to write his portrait of Probus he relied primarily on the books in the Ulpian Library, which had been removed in his time to the Baths of Diocletian (*aetate mea thermis Diocletianis*), books from the Tiberian Palace, the registers (*registis*) of the clerks of the Porticus Purpuretica, the transactions of the senate and people (*actis senatus ac populi*), and the journals of an older friend, Turdulus Gallicanus. Many library scholars have debated the removal of books to Diocletian's Baths because it is known the Ulpian Library continued its existence to the time of Sidonius Apollinaris. The statement has been both rejected⁵⁷ and

accepted, often in the limited sense that only a few books were transferred.⁵⁸ The official opening of Diocletian's Baths occurred between 1 May 305 and 25 July 306, completing a construction period that had lasted approximately eight years.⁵⁹ Apparently part of the Ulpian Library collection was removed for the purpose of having a small deposit for bathers on the Quirinal Hill. Considering the small size of Trajan's library (each room was approximately 2,700 square feet), it would not be surprising that space would become a problem after two centuries. No doubt the proximity of the Ulpian Library to the *Thermae Diocletiani* was one motive for the transfer, although it has been postulated that the move was only a temporary measure caused by building renovations to the Basilica Ulpia during Constantine's reign.⁶⁰

The most interesting comments on Vopiscus's transfer passage have been issued by Boyd, who believed the existence of the *vili-cus themarum bibliothecarum* was generally supported by Vopiscus's remark.⁶¹ Further, he was tempted to propose that there was no actual transfer of the library, but rather the establishment of a small new collection.⁶² Both these suggestions should be regarded as the most plausible interpretations. Vopiscus was anxious to stress that he used many collections, such as the Tiberian palace library, and, in fact, his reference to the clerk's registers at the colonnade of the Porticus Purpuretica in Trajan's Forum is the only report of it in antiquity.⁶³ Of course, his use of the senatorial transactions and the journals of his friend Turdulus Gallicanus are unsubstantiated. Vopiscus may be partially believed in *Probus* 2, 1; however, it is wise to be conservative in judging his remarks.

Vopiscus makes two final revelations about libraries in *Tacitus* 10, 3, and *Numerianus* 11, 2-3. In Tacitus's biography he relates that the historian of the same name was a forebear of the emperor, and that the monarch ordered ten copies of his illustrious ancestor's works made each year by copyists and placed in libraries. Tacitus's alleged preservation of texts is laudable; however his relationship to the historian of the same name is entirely fictitious.⁶⁴ Vopiscus's second reference is to the emperor Numerian, who, according to Vopiscus, was an eloquent speaker and poet, a man able to compete with such notable poets as Olympius Nemesianus. On one occasion after Numerian forwarded a speech to the Senate, the fathers voted him a statue for his oratorical powers and set it up in the Ulpian Library, bearing the inscription: "To Caesar Numerian, the most powerful orator of his time." If this event took place it happened sometime in 282/283 before Numerian became emperor. The poet referred to, M. Aurelius Olympius Nemesianus,

was from Carthage and his *Eclogae* and *Cynegetica* compiled ca. 283/284 have survived in part.⁶⁵ But it may be doubted whether he was ever bested by Numerian in poetic competition. The author of the HA is fond of attributing oratorical or poetical powers to the emperors of the third century, for example, Gordian the elder.⁶⁶ Naturally no works that can be ascribed to these particular emperors have survived, if indeed they ever existed. Needless to say, none of Numerian's works survives, nor does his statue exist today. It is not necessary to believe that it was ever erected.⁶⁷ Again, in both these cases the insights on libraries are not of use to the library historian.

To evaluate the nine occasions when Vopiscus makes reference to libraries and to his sources produces a discouraging record for historical purposes:

- A. *Aurelianus* 1, 1–10: a charming introductory episode that is suspect and cannot be regarded as historical.
- B. *Aurelianus* 8, 1–5: a forged *epistula*.
- C. *Aurelianus* 9, 1–7: a forged *epistula*.
- D. *Aurelianus* 24, 2–9: an imaginary tale that capitalizes on the mythic element associated with Apollonius of Tyana.
- E. *Tacitus* 8, 1–2, and *Probus* 7, 1: two references concerning a *senatus consultum* in the Ulpian Library that contradict the existence of this document.
- F. *Probus* 2, 1: a careful justification of his sources that records the existence of a small library collection in the Baths of Diocletian.
- G. *Tacitus* 10, 3: a fraudulent reference to copies of works by the historian Tacitus placed in libraries.
- H. *Numerianus* 11, 2–3: the erection of a nonexistent statue of this emperor in the Ulpian Library.

The entire offering gives scant information for library history. Fiction cannot be made into fact, and it must be accepted that there is little value in the remarks about libraries in the HA's third-century biographies because the author obviously is not recording history but is motivated by other purposes. It appears he is desirous of achieving credit for researching and discovering documents, yet he indulges in deception for the sake of humor on many occasions. He also has striven to promote the brief biographic sketch on the model of Suetonius. His purpose is to deceive his readers.

But what of the author himself? At the beginning of this article

the fondness of the author of the HA for libraries was alluded to. At this point it is necessary to discuss the theories of Alfred von Domaszewski, who dealt in part with the HA's reference to libraries in two articles.⁶⁸ Domaszewski accepted the theory of forgery after studying remarks on the geography in Rome and the empire, and the dates and personal names in the HA. On the basis of his work he arrived at the extraordinary hypothesis that the author of the HA lived in Nemausus in Gaul (modern Nîmes in southern France) and composed the HA in the later part of the sixth century. With regard to some passages disclosed in this article, Domaszewski rejected all the HA's references to the *bibliotheca Ulpia* because he insisted the official name for this library was *bibliotheca Templi Trajani*. Further, he maintained the author was actually referring to the library in Nemausus where the writer served as municipal *curator*, or civic manager.⁶⁹ Thus, the forger's references to the transfer of books to Diocletian's Baths or the books in the Porticus Purpuretica are discarded as outright inventions on the basis of terminology.⁷⁰ Few scholars have adopted Domaszewski's general theory, and it must be pointed out that one need not accept his ideas to reject the evidence provided by the HA. As outlined before, there are many considerations that lead to skepticism about the HA's mention of libraries and materials in libraries. While it is tempting to believe that the author was a *curator* of a municipal library, there is no substantial evidence to support this position.⁷¹ For these reasons Domaszewski's theories have not been accepted.

One of the HA's conventional methods to win over readers does offer some information on the author. The writer repeatedly urges his readers to check his accuracy in documents he uncovered. The question can be fairly asked: why would a clever forger request that his readers check the veracity of his statements by examining the actual records in libraries? The answer can only be that he was certain there was no possibility of this happening. Obviously, assigning his work the appearance of an earlier origin would impart more authority and make it more difficult for his readers to discover his fraud, but if alert readers took the trouble to search for the bogus documents they might become suspicious if none was available. However, if the author knew that the libraries in question were no longer in active use, or had suffered losses that would explain the disappearance of documents, he could introduce his own fabrications without fear of being uncovered as a falsifier. Viewed in this manner, Ammianus Marcellinus's statement ca. 375 that the public libraries of Rome were closed like tombs takes on

more significance, although his recollections of Rome were generally critical because he was not accepted by aristocratic Romans.⁷² The final death knell for public libraries that had been established in temples came after 24 February 391, when the emperor Theodosius the Great enacted a series of laws that effectively forbade sacrifices, worship of the pagan gods, and the visiting of temples for worship.⁷³ As a result, the collections in libraries that were associated with temples, especially the Ulpian Library and the library in the *Templum Pacis*, would no longer be accessible.⁷⁴ In these circumstances, an ambitious forger could give free rein to his fervid imagination, provided his account was not too sensational and agreed in part with existing histories that were recognized. This hypothesis depends upon the acceptance of a late date for the HA, perhaps the last decade of the fourth century; if this is acceptable it helps provide a sound explanation for the author's references to documents in libraries.

At the outset of this article it was stated the analysis of the HA would help revise conceptions of Roman libraries. It can be realized now that most of the passages are not acceptable for a historical record of libraries. Nonetheless, once the persistent reliance upon the HA for genuine library history is tempered, a clearer perspective emerges concerning the decline of many Roman public libraries. Recently, scholars have minimized the impact that public libraries in Rome had upon intellectual life because they were not research oriented, they served a limited reading public, and their collections remained small and were occasionally ravaged by fires.⁷⁵ In truth the appellation "public" is not particularly correct in the modern sense because a large reading segment of the population did not exist; reading was mostly the pastime of the educated upper and middle classes of society. No doubt the author of the HA was well aware that he was writing for a small audience whose educational training had been largely rhetorical and uncritical in nature. Perhaps he believed he could write an entertaining history complete with bogus authors and sources to conceal his true identity. This knowledge tells us something about the spirit of the HA and the apparent lack of adequate library resources when it was composed. Arguments about the author and his purposes will continue, but it is unlikely library historians can depend on the HA for authentic evidence for the history of Roman libraries. After all, if the author was satisfied to rely upon the unavailability of sources in libraries to disguise his imposture, what is there to be said for the influence of libraries in Rome while he was writing, shortly before 400?

It follows that the decline of libraries can be inferred from the HA's statements. Normally, the establishment and the promotion of libraries definitely relied upon imperial patronage. A significant change is revealed between the HA's early chapters on Hadrian, Antoninus Pius, and Marcus Aurelius, where the Tiberian palace library is at the very heart of literate culture, and the later chapters on Aurelian, where Vopiscus resorts to nonexistent letters or vague references to Aurelian's remarkable military exploits, which did not attract Latin historians. One cannot imagine a similar lack of interest in the early empire; indeed the contrast between the vibrant Tiberian palace library of the second century and the shadowy existence of the fourth-century Ulpian Library is unmistakable after critical examination. By the time of Aurelian, Rome's position at the center of the Graeco-Roman culture—that is, the established heritage of the dominant upper classes and ruling elites in the empire—had deteriorated perceptibly. The emperors no longer took up residence in the capital for long periods; instead they were needed along the frontiers to repel barbarian attacks. Although Rome remained the educational and cultural center of the western empire after Constantine's foundation of Constantinople on 11 May 330, the establishment of libraries in the new capital assumed greater importance from this time.⁷⁶

It is evident in the HA that usage of libraries also changed. Pollio's unnamed critics gathered in the Forum Pacis for their discussion of current cultural topics, but they are not of the calibre of men like Maecianus who surrounded Marcus Aurelius. Doubtless there were fewer opportunities for expression of ideas and tastes in an era of warfare and decline; even the book trade lacked its former vigor in metropolitan centers such as Antioch.⁷⁷ Limited access to library collections after 375 further restricted the growth and interaction of thought and the transmission of books. Thus the promotion, usage, and accessibility of libraries, which had depended on factors associated with the more prosperous early empire—a period eulogized by Aelius Aristides (died ca. 181) as a time of peace, happiness, economic prosperity, and enlightened rule⁷⁸—had changed drastically by the time the HA's author was composing his biographies. His lack of precision and reliance upon bogus sources in the second half of the HA reflect part of this cultural erosion. A comparison with references to libraries in *De Caesaribus* is instructive: in the second century Suetonius was able to refer to works by title⁷⁹ and to books censored by the early Julian emperors;⁸⁰ his sources were more reliable and more plentiful.⁸¹ The HA's author depended upon fewer sources that

were less scrupulously researched, upon his own imagination. He is unable to discuss imperial munificence in library building even though there was a continuation of the policy to establish public libraries in Rome after the reign of Hadrian.⁸² The issue of censorship in libraries is nowhere found in the HA. Nor is the assistance of librarians in creating a corpus of literature for public use ever mentioned. There is a great gulf separating the society that first received *De Caesaribus* and the HA.

The third and fourth centuries were a time of far-reaching cultural and social transformation. Traditional Graeco-Roman civilization was in decline, and with it the Roman library. Greek rationalism was being supplanted by Christian faith. The city of Rome was losing its ascendancy to Constantinople. The ruling aristocracy was ousted from political and military commands by a bureaucracy loyal to the soldier emperors. New aesthetic tastes replaced the classic values of Hellenism in art, and in science supra-rational practices such as alchemy and astrology replaced serious rational inquiry.⁸³ The extension of citizenship to all free residents of the empire in 212 blurred older Roman distinctions. Inflation of the coinage seriously eroded economic stability. Roman libraries were also transformed in this process, not only by external forces, but by the fundamental role of serving a limited portion of Roman society that had lost its place at the center. This transition deserves further study to understand the evolving institutional role and declining influence of the Roman public library. The HA has provided one source for this work, yet in the final analysis it alone does not provide an adequate framework for general theories because only a modest vantage point is established: from the perspective of the late fourth century the HA presents indirect information on three library careers, and on the libraries in the Tiberian palace, Forum Pacis, Baths of Diocletian, and Trajan's Forum. This evidence is contributed by an author who is cognizant of the limitations of Roman city libraries and uses his knowledge to conceal his identity and purpose. This statement may be a fitting epitaph for the importance of libraries at Rome in the late fourth century, but we know it was not always true.

Notes

1. The best edition with commentary is by Ernst H. Hohl, *Scriptores Historiae Augustae*, 2 vols. revised with corrigenda (Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1965), David Magie (trans.), *Scriptores Historiae Augustae*, 3 vols. (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1921–1932), gives an English translation

with useful commentary although he does not subscribe to current theories on the HA.

2. Carlo Castellani, *Le biblioteche nell'antichità dai tempi più remoti alla fine dell'impero Romano d'Occidente* (Bologna: Monti, 1884), pp. 27–57.

3. Filippo Garbelli, *Le biblioteche in Italia all'epoca Romana con un'appendice sulle antiche Biblioteche di Niveve ed Alessandria* (Milan: Ulrico Hoepli, 1894).

4. André Langie, *Les Bibliothèques publiques dans l'ancienne Rome et dans l'empire Romain* (Fribourg: Fragnière Frères, 1908).

5. Clarence E. Boyd, *Public Libraries and Literary Culture in Ancient Rome* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1916).

6. Max Ihm, "Die Bibliotheken im alten Rom," *Zentralblatt für Bibliothekswesen* 10, no. 12 (1893): 513–532.

7. For example, James W. Thompson, *Ancient Libraries* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1940), pp. 27–50; Evelyn H. Clift, *Latin "Pseud-epigrapha": A Study in Literary Attributions* (Baltimore: J. H. Furst, 1945), pp. 1–39; Fritz Milkau and Georg Leyh (eds.), *Handbuch der Bibliothekswissenschaft*, 3 vols. in 4 (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1950–1960), vol. 3, pt. 1, pp. 111–128; Herman Jean de Vleeschauwer, "The Roman Library," *Mousaion* 72 (1964): 103–139; Jeppe Tønsberg, *Offentlige biblioteker i Romerriget i det 2. Århundrede e. Chr.* (Copenhagen: Danmarks Biblioteksskole, 1976); and Lawrence S. Thompson, "Roman and Greek Libraries," in Allan Kent, Harold Lancour, Jay E. Daily (eds.), *Encyclopedia of Library and Information Science* (New York: Marcel Dekker, 1968–), vol. 26, pp. 19–28 (hereafter cited as *ELIS*).

8. Andreas Alföldi and Johannes Straub (eds.), *Bonner Historia-Augusta-Colloquium* (Bonn: Rudolf Habelt, 1963–).

9. Two works by Ronald Syme, *Ammianus and the Historia Augusta* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968) and *Emperors and Biography: Studies in the Historia Augusta* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971), provide excellent studies of the HA.

10. Syme, *Ammianus*, p. 218.

11. *Ibid.*, p. 183.

12. For example, the closing statement in *Carus, Carinus et Numerianus* 11, 2.

13. See *Aurelianus* 1, 4, which is discussed later in this article.

14. *Gordiani tres* 2, 1. Three Gordians held imperial power, not two as reported by the Latin epitomators. For the HA's borrowings, see Timothy D. Barnes, *The Sources of the Historia Augusta* (Brussels: Collection Latomus, 1978).

15. *Hadrianus* 11, 2.

16. See Samuel Ball Platner, *A Topographical Dictionary of Ancient Rome*, revised by Thomas Ashby (London: Oxford University Press, 1929), pp. 191–194; and Ernest Nash, *Pictorial Dictionary of Ancient Rome*, 2 vols., revised edition (London: Thames and Hudson, 1968), vol. 1, pp. 365–374.

17. Marcus Cornelius Fronto, *Epistulae* 4.5.

18. Aulus Gellius, *Noctes Atticae* 13.20.1.

19. Syme, *Emperors*, p. 40, refers to *Antoninus Pius* 10, 4, as an "anecdote" but the force of the other three passages leaves no doubt of the Tiberian palace library's importance. Langie, *Bibliothèques*, p. 63, uses these references as support for the Tiberian library's existence. Men of the stature of

Fronto and Herodes Atticus were active in literary circles at Rome and could frequently consult this library while tutoring Lucius Verus and Marcus Aurelius.

20. For Marcus's education, see Anthony Birley, *Marcus Aurelius* (London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1966), pp. 75–112.

21. *Hadrianus* 15, 3.

22. Otto Hirschfeld, *Die kaiserlichen Verwaltungsbeamten bis auf Diocletian*, 2nd ed. (Berlin: Weidmann, 1905), p. 303.

23. For Eudaemon's career, see Hans-Georg Pflaum, *Les Carrières procuratoriennes équestres sous le haut-empire romain*, 3 vols. (Paris: Paul Geuthner, 1960–1961), vol. 1, pp. 264–271, especially 267–268. His identification is not clearly outlined in library histories: see Langie, *Bibliothèques*, pp. 139–140; Boyd, *Public Libraries*, p. 42; Tønsberg, *Offentlige biblioteker*, p. 124; and Ihm, "Bibliotheken," p. 523.

24. For his administrative career, see Pflaum, *Les Carrières*, vol. 1, pp. 219–224. The Algerian inscription is discussed by Gavin B. Townend, "The Hippo Inscription and the Career of Suetonius," *Historia* 10 (1961): 97–109.

25. See Heinz Gomoll, "Suetons bibliotheksgeschichtliche Nachrichten," *Zentralblatt für Bibliothekswesen* 52 (1935): 381–388.

26. His career is outlined in Pflaum, *Les Carrières*, vol. 1, pp. 333–337.

27. Castellani, *Bibliothèque*, p. 34; Garbelli, *Bibliothèque*, p. 105; Ihm, "Bibliotheken," p. 530; Langie, *Bibliothèques*, p. 121; Vleeschauwer, "Roman Library," p. 119; Lawrence Thompson, "Private Libraries," *ELIS*, vol. 24 (1978), p. 128; and Raymond Irwin, "Seneca: Studies in the History of Libraries—X," *Library Association Record* 58 (1956): 418.

28. See Thompson, *Ancient Libraries*, pp. 34 and 37; and Clift, *Latin "Pseudepigrapha"*, pp. 32–33. Garbelli, *Bibliothèque*, p. 157, rejects this argument for the Capitoline library.

29. Syme, *Emperors*, p. 279.

30. Milkau and Leyh, *Handbuch*, vol. 3, pt. 1, p. 117.

31. See Platner, *Topographical Dictionary*, pp. 237–245; Nash, *Pictorial Dictionary*, vol. 1, pp. 439–445; and August Pauly, Georg Wissowa, Wilhelm Kroll, and Karl Mittelhaus (eds.), *Real-Encyclopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft* (Stuttgart: Metzler, 1893–), "Pacis Forum," vol. 18, pt. 2 (1942), cols. 2107–2122, especially 2109. Hereafter cited as *Real-Encyclopädie*.

32. Ihm, "Bibliotheken," p. 521; Langie, *Bibliothèques*, pp. 69–70; Boyd, *Public Libraries*, p. 60; Clift, *Latin "Pseudepigrapha"*, p. 28; Milkau and Leyh, *Handbuch*, vol. 3, pt. 1, p. 122; Vleeschauwer, "Roman Library," p. 115; and Tønsberg, *Offentlige biblioteker*, pp. 44–45.

33. "Hilaria," in *Real-Encyclopädie*, vol. 8, pt. 2 (1913), cols. 1597–1598.

34. For his career, see André Chastagnol, *Les Fastes de la préfecture de Rome au bas-empire* (Paris: Nouvelles Editions latines, 1962), pp. 17–20. His son, Junius Tiberianus, was also prefect in 302–303; see Chastagnol, *Les Fastes*, pp. 40–41.

35. See Platner, *Topographical Dictionary*, pp. 491–493.

36. See Robert M. Ogilvie, "Livy, Licinius Macer and the *Libri Lintei*," *Journal of Roman Studies* 48 (1958): 40–48.

37. Courtenay E. Stevens, *Sidonius Apollinaris and His Age* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1933), pp. 30–35, discusses this panegyric in detail.

38. Syme, *Ammianus*, p. 192, dismisses these phrases but also gives a bibliography of dissenting opinions.

39. For example, Chastagnol, *Les Fastes*, pp. 19–20.

40. Magie, *Scriptores Historiae Augustae*, vol. 3, p. 194; and Vleeschauwer, "Roman Library," p. 115.

41. Castellani, *Biblioteche*, pp. 54–55; Garbelli, *Biblioteche*, p. 158; Ihm, "Bibliotheken," p. 521; Langie, *Bibliothèques*, p. 116; Boyd, *Public Libraries*, pp. 38–39 and 56.

42. A. H. M. Jones, J. R. Martindale, T. Morris (eds.), *The Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire*, 2 vols. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1971–1980), "C. Iunius Tiberianus," vol. 1, p. 912 (hereafter cited as *PLRE*).

43. Hirschfeld, *Die kaiserlichen Verwaltungsbeamten*, p. 306; Langie, *Bibliothèques*, pp. 138–139, summarizes the argument but is noncommittal. The argument is favored by Tønberg, *Offentlige biblioteker*, p. 125; Thompson, "Roman and Greek Libraries," in *ELIS*, vol. 26, p. 32; and Vleeschauwer, "Roman Library," p. 118.

44. William G. Sinnigen, *The Officium of the Urban Prefecture during the Later Roman Empire* (Rome: American Academy in Rome, 1957), pp. 111–114, sums up the evidence.

45. Magie, *Scriptores*, vol. 3, p. 206, and "Publius Licinius Egnatius Gallienus," in *Real-Encyclopädie*, vol. 13 (1926), cols. 355–358.

46. See Magie, *Scriptores Historiae Augustae*, vol. 3, p. 211.

47. "Nummius Ceionius Albinus," in *PLRE*, vol. 1, p. 35.

48. Mireille Corbier, *L'"Aerarium Saturni" et L'"Aerarium Militaire": Administration et prosopographie sénatoriale* (Rome: Ecole française de Rome, 1974), p. 346, rejects this statement in *Aurelianus* 9, 2–7.

49. Boyd, *Public Libraries*, p. 39.

50. See Eduard von Wölfflin, *Die Scriptores Historiae Augustae*, Sitzungsberichte der philosophisch-philologische und historische Classe der Königlich-bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften zu München (Munich: C. H. Beck'schen, 1891), p. 497. Wölfflin was attempting to show that Vopiscus was the general editor of the HA by studying the language of the *vitae*. Langie, *Bibliothèques*, p. 64, rejects his arguments. Boyd, *Public Libraries*, p. 35, is noncommittal.

51. See B. A. van Groningen, "Apollonius de Tyane," *Bulletin de la Faculté des Lettres de Strasbourg* 30 (1951–1952): 107–116.

52. "Lucius Domitius Aurelianus," in *Real-Encyclopädie*, vol. 5, pt. 1 (1903), col. 1383.

53. Boyd, *Public Libraries*, p. 55, accepts this passage. For Philostratus, see Glenn W. Bowersock, *Greek Sophists in the Roman Empire* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1969), pp. 4–16.

54. Ernst H. Hohl, "Vopiscus und die Biographie des Kaisers Tacitus," *Klio* 11 (1911): 294–295, cites Tacitus 8.1 and 10.3 as passages not deserving credence.

55. "Senatus Consultum," in *Real-Encyclopädie*, suppl. 6 (1935), cols. 804–805. Boyd, *Public Libraries*, pp. 56–57, and Tønberg, *Offentlige biblioteker*, pp. 49–50, accept the senate decree.

56. See Carl Wendel, "Der antike Bucherschrank," and "Armarium Legum," in *Kleine Schriften zum antiken Buch- und Bibliothekswesen* (Cologne: Greven, 1974), pp. 64–107.

57. B. Kuebler, "Bibliotheca," in Ettore de Ruggiero (ed.), *Dizionario*

epigrafico di antichità romane (Rome: L. Pasqualucci, 1886–), vol. 1, col. 1003.

58. For example, Castellani, *Biblioteche*, pp. 56–57; Garbelli, *Biblioteche*, p. 159; Ihm, “Bibliotheken,” p. 521; Clift, *Latin “Pseudepigrapha”*, p. 30; Milkau and Leyh, *Handbuch*, vol. 3, pt. 1, p. 123; Tønsberg, *Offentlige biblioteker*, pp. 50 and 59–60; Thompson, “Roman and Greek Libraries,” *ELIS*, vol. 26, p. 23; Bernt Götze, “Antike Bibliotheken,” *Jahrbuch des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts* 52 (1937): 240; and Christian Callmer, “Antike Bibliotheken,” *Opuscula Archaeologica* 3 (1944): 164.

59. Salvatore Aurigemma, *The Baths of Diocletian and the Museo Nazionale Romano*, 7th ed. (Rome: Istituto Poligrafico Dello Stato, 1974), pp. 3–12, gives an outline history.

60. Langie, *Bibliothèques*, pp. 72–73.

61. Boyd, *Public Libraries*, p. 46.

62. *Ibid.*, p. 38.

63. Platner, *Topographical Dictionary*, p. 239.

64. Ronald Syme, *Tacitus*, 2 vols. (Oxford: University Press, 1958), vol. 1, p. 59. However, Vopiscus's statement is accepted by Langie, *Bibliothèques*, p. 120; Boyd, *Public Libraries*, pp. 40 and 68; and Vleeschauwer, “Roman Library,” p. 117, note 120. Raymond Irwin, “The Economics of Reading and Writing; Studies in the History of Libraries—IV,” *Library Association Record* 56 (1954): 284, accepts the statement on copying but rejects the emperor's lineage.

65. “M. Aurelius Olympius Nemesianus,” in *PLRE*, vol. 1, p. 622; and André Chastagnol, “Trois études sur la Vita Carii; II Nemesianus et Calpurnius,” in *Bonner Historia-Augusta-Colloquium 1972–1974*, pp. 81–84.

66. *Gordiani tres* 3, 2–4.

67. “Marcus Aurelius Numerianus,” in *Real-Encyclopädie*, suppl. 11 (1968), col. 1018. Nevertheless, the statement had received wide acceptance by Ihm, “Bibliotheken,” p. 516; Langie, *Bibliothèques*, p. 115; Garbelli, *Biblioteche*, p. 109; and Boyd, *Public Libraries*, pp. 55–56.

68. Alfred von Domaszewski, *Die Topographie Roms bei den Scriptores Historiae Augustae*, Sitzungsberichte der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophische-Historische Klasse, vol. 7, transaction 7 (Heidelberg: C. Winter, 1916); and *Die Personennamen bei den Scriptores Historiae Augustae*, Sitz. der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philos.-Hist. Klasse, vol. 9, transaction 13 (Heidelberg, 1918).

69. Domaszewski, *Die Personennamen*, pp. 49–52.

70. Domaszewski, *Die Topographie Roms*, p. 9; and *Die Personennamen*, pp. 46 and 49–52.

71. For the library at Nîmes, see Rudolf Naumann, *Der Quellbezirk von Nîmes* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1937), pp. 2–29; and Tønsberg, *Offentlige biblioteker*, pp. 70–73.

72. Ammianus Marcellinus, *Rerum gestarum libri* 14.6.18. For his stay at Rome, see Alan Cameron, “The Roman Friends of Ammianus,” *Journal of Roman Studies* 54 (1964): 15–28.

73. See Noel Quinton King, *The Emperor Theodosius and the Establishment of Christianity* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1960), pp. 77–82, for this edict.

74. Donald G. Davis, Jr., “Christianity and Pagan Libraries in the Later Roman Empire,” *Library History* 2 (1970): 1–10, reviews this process.

75. Raymond Irwin, "Ancient Libraries," in *ELIS*, vol. 1 (1968): pp. 405–406; and Tønsberg, *Offentlige biblioteker*, pp. 130–131. However, Langie, *Bibliothèques*, pp. 154–155, Boyd, *Public Libraries*, pp. 66–69, and Clift, *Latin "Pseudepigrapha"*, pp. 38–39, emphasize the useful role of libraries in the transmission of literature in Roman society. This question deserves greater study. The negative aspects of the HA led Wölfflin, *Die Scriptores Historiae Augustae*, p. 479, to question the importance of the Ulpian Library, but use of the HA alone is not a suitable measure.

76. Carl Wendel, "Die erste kaiserliche Bibliothek in Konstantinople," in *Kleine Schriften zum antiken Buch- und Bibliothekwesen*, pp. 46–63.

77. Compare Felix Reichmann, "The Book Trade at the Time of the Roman Empire," *Library Quarterly* 8 (1938): 40–77, with A. F. Norman, "The Book Trade in Fourth-Century Antioch," *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 80 (1960): 122–126.

78. See James H. Oliver (ed.), *The Ruling Power* (Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1953), pp. 895–907, for Aristides' address "To Rome."

79. For example, Suetonius, *Claudius* 41.2–3, refers to this emperor's autobiography, his history of the civil wars, and "Defense of Cicero against the Writings of Asinius Gallus," works that are lost to us now.

80. Suetonius, *Augustus* 31.1 and *Caligula* 16.2.

81. Gavin B. Townend, "The Date and Composition of Suetonius's *Caesares*," *Classical Quarterly* 9 (1959): 285–293, concludes his history was written between 119 and 132.

82. For example, the library in the Pantheon: see Frank Granger, "Julius Africanus and the Library in the Pantheon," *Journal of Theological Studies* 39 (1933): 151–161.

83. This is not to say that rational inquiry and research was at an end. Pliny the Elder lamented the lack of research and critical spirit in his own time (i.e., ca. 23/24–79) in his *Naturalis Historia* 2.45.117–118. As late as the reign of Valentinian and Valens (364–375) an anonymous writer of *De rebus bellicis* outlined imaginative reforms and serious proposals for the imperial administration, army, and law. But significantly his audience ignored his advice and he was forgotten, while Pliny's works were well known during the second and third centuries.